



## **Work Group 1: Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation Meeting 4: September 20, 2018**

### **Check In:**

All members, guest speakers, city staff and members of community were asked to name a time when they enjoyed getting stuck in the rain.

***Grounding Review Guideline Question Logistics:*** Review of guideline questions proposed by members in meeting #3 on September 6, 2018.

- **Question** - Is the structure of NCR to be discussed as part of the framework recommendations of this group?
  - Answer from Bob Cooper/NCR staff: Guidelines can include roles and responsibility (of NCR). I think not at a micromanaging level but I think at a high level in terms of support you'll receive, this should be included. Workgroup #3 is also representing this.
- **Logistics** -
  - Members were given two worksheets summarizing last meeting's guidelines
    - Shorter worksheet represented those that were voted on during meeting #3 that were either
      - Over 70% threshold in first vote so taken out as they will be included in framework
      - So far under threshold it won't make it
  - Members voted on remaining from longer worksheet
    - Each guideline was discussed with any member invited to present a "pro" or "con" for keeping it prior to voting. After this discussion, a vote was taken with:
      - Red vote meaning "Eliminate"
      - Green vote meaning "Keep" and group will later decide if this becomes a "Best practice" vs "Requirement"
      - NOTE: Members were allowed to abstain

### ***Guideline Question Pro/Con Discussions:***

Note that not all guidelines had significant discussion before vote.

Summary of outcomes -

- After voting members expressed varying view points that formed the basis of their vote.
  - In some cases members voted based on what they thought could get passed. Steve reminded that this is not preferred way to vote

- NCR staff also reminded members that this is a long, grueling process. And process should cause you to think of the greater good instead of just your individual situation.
- A member expressed disappointment over votes that didn't seem to keep equity top of mind. After much discussion it was decided to extend guidelines discussion into the next meeting and allow for a look back to close votes and perhaps discuss again/re-vote. (see homework)

#### #1 KEEP (6 to 1): – Board member term limits

##### PROS:

- Pushes boards to empower new leaders
- Struggled for decades with same people. Feels like a social club
- Board members dont want to give up power and push those down.
- Someone can go off but still be involved

##### CONS: If there are not new leaders available it can allow

- Board term limits are best practices
- Can city make them? Yes. We can. They can choose not to and then risk not get funding
- Prefer city focus on the result they want. Perhaps the mandate should be leadership development rather than a specific
- Measuring something you dont actually want to measure
- You end up removing people that do have the interest

#### #3 – ELIMINATED (2 to 6): Uniform board eligibility (youth, businesses, special seats, union reps, etc). This would say each group has the same.

##### Pro:

- You could make it pretty general

##### Con:

- If you let anyone who shows up we have seen boards get filled by groups with specific interests
- Each neighborhood is so different
- Not much transparency
- It feels a better fit would be board training, bylaws, etc where you consider membership

#### #4 Early Voting (2 to 6) - ELIMINATED

##### Pro

- Could you tell people ahead that more might be
- Voting outside of a meeting would be an important
- Fairly significant % works in the evening

##### Con

- You take away all opportunity to have debate on the board
- Annual elections
- One meeting had “Late voting”
- Viability would become even more administrative work
- Power gets congealed

#### NEW: Provide for alternative methods of voting options

## #5 (10/0) – Uniform Annual Meeting Agendas

Pro:

- I think that is how you run a good nonprofit
- Not an exhaustive list
- Our neighborhood each year would
- This feels like a best practice
- I would argue it is a requirement. It is not the org money. These are minimal report
- Annual meeting is how people get involved

Con

- Bylaw changes
- A lot of this is already covered in state meetings. And to requirement this means more NCR time
- Saying it has to be at an annual meeting can seem bossy

## #7 Baseline (7/3) - Funding to non-neighborhood groups

- A minimum amount of money
- Or a formula? (Could be both)

Pro:

Con:

- I would question the baseline because of size differences

## #9 Funding to non-neighborhood groups

### 9a – Altogether Different groups, same guidelines, same pot (1/8)

### 9b – Separate pot, separate guidelines (9/1)

- Not saying city should create a new one. But guidelines should be broadened so they are
- Marcus Comment – this is a very serious change from up until today.
  - Will they have a conversation with neighborhood groups? Are we disregarding? Does it inform?
    - Are we saying that cultural community groups would associating with neighborhoods
  - It seems like a tough conversation in the context of groups
  - Do we believe in neighborhood orgs to do the question, then I want to see them
  - I would like to see neighborhoods be a different
  - f we vote yes on #9 then we are including cultural groups that have to abide by
  - Marcea – why is this even on here?
    - Con – separate pots. don't know if we have the authority. Until we though
- If we just said that cultural groups are not geographic anyway,
- Can we require groups to work together. What happens when they overlap?
- Digging way into the weeds here. Which groups are going to be represented
- You're talking about funding and deliverables.
- might we be talking about neighborhood funds that could be available if they worked with neighborhoods?

## #10 – Collaboration between Neighborhoods and Culural Groups (9/1)

Pro-

- One way you could do this is to begin to figure out needs for engagement. Once you have that number you can start leveling out. You strategically design the process.
- It should be incentivized
- I don't think it has to be oppositional

Con –

- Neighborhoods funded throughout the city. Where do you draw the line?
- I thought I was for this and yet there are other groups that cross boundaries (neighborhoods and business associations). And that can often sell short understanding what residents need
- This is an issue you hope to eliminate (there is an us them, but there shouldn't be)
  - This is “us/them” is making me really frustrated

#11 - Staff Funded Organizations will have paid professional staff (6 to 5)

#12 – Discretionary funds (10/1)

We know there isn't going to be a lot of money so to create a discretionary pot it would take away from outreach

#13 Competitive Funding

Pro: Would able to compete for city priorities

Con: It will water down the pot

(#16 should not be on worksheet - duplicate)

19: Budgeting to reflect for geographic (4/5)

Pro -

- Renters have different interests
- Is this a best practice

Con –

- We have had disagreements in the past and its led to debates

#20 – Infrastructure: Have dedicated post off address for organization – (6/5)

Con – IRS requires street address

#21 – Required Basic Meetings (0/10)

do people need monthly meetings open to public?

#22 Mandatory door knocking (5/6)

- Pro –
  - Quality of interaction is lower - In terms of identifying what community needs
- Con –
  - I think city needs to focus on deliverables. It's a tool.
  - I don't think the language is nuanced enough

### #23c – Changed language to to clarify and satisfy fully (11/0)

“Accounting Ability: organizations must have an acceptable contractual agreement for funded organization to cooperate in cases of fraud or embezzlement

Question: Is there an ethical question about “you should speak up”?

- Answer: This is not what the guideline is focused on.

Con –

- We have taken to the white collar crimes unit and they have refused to do anything
- It may deter you from participating

### #24 Create a minimum duty to perform for funded organizations (11/0)

### #25 Same day citywide election for board members (7/4)

- Pro –
  - Example – a “Connections conference” – all have same conference/day
- Con –
  - people can't be in two places at once (some council members like to go to each)
  - why spend money on this?

### #29 – Childcare: NCR contracts with childcare providers (6/5)

- Pro –
  - absolutely necessary for access
  - City can provide contracted
  - Nothing means they have to use service, but just says city will offer
  - Shouldn't be denying access just due to costs
- Con
  - what happens if city can't monitor childcare and something goes wrong?
  - How is this different for transportation? (that we aren't funding)
  - We might be talking about costs per neighborhood and this could be a big chunk

### #30 Outreach/Door knocking: NCR Dept contracts with groups to provide door knocking services (5/5)

Pro

- Pros
  - Example of previous use where member saw this used – received 4,000 supporter responses and it helped project
  - Same argument as for child care – don't have to use but it would be nice to have service

Con –

- Defeats purpose because door knocking is about relationship

### #32 – Training for best practices (11/0)

### 33 – Board Training (10/1)

### #35 – Technology (10/1)

**#39 Citywide Recognition Awards/Creating a “Best of” (7/4)**

Pro – good press

Con –

- political
- competitiveness
- award winner are you going to get paid for all of the consultations

**#40 – Collaborations: Funded organizations would be encouraged to observe other funded organizations' board meetings (9/0)**

**#43 – HR Services (11/0) Not on the list on the board**

*ADDED three*

Neighborhoods would have access through recommendations or actionable items from CLIC. - This would be Capital projects

**Set aside \$ from CCPC (7/0)**

**Food provided (11/0)**

**Check Out:**

- Next meeting is Tuesday, October 2 from 6 to 8 p.m.
  - Location: Crown Roller Building
- Resource reminders:
  - Use the Workgroup Resource Library, <http://www.minneapolismn.gov/ncr/2020> .
  - Reference materials [here](#)
- Homework:
  - If you have more thoughts on any of the guidelines – that passed or that did not – please email Steve by Friday, September 28
    - Steve will combine all and present at next meeting
      - [Steven.gallagher@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:Steven.gallagher@minneapolismn.gov)
      - 612.673.2905
- **Next meeting – Extend guidelines discussion**